

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

With the addition of new claims 15 to 18, claims 8 to 18 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for immediate allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 8 and 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0231098 ("Wan"). It is respectfully submitted that Wan does not anticipate the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 8 recites, inter alia, that eight GMR resistor elements are arranged in a **rotationally symmetrical positioning**. While the Office Action contends that Figure 2D of Wan discloses this positioning, any review of Figure 2D makes readily apparent that the magnetoresistive elements 106-1, 108-1, etc., are not all arranged in a **rotationally symmetrical positioning**. For example, magnetoresistive element 106-1 is **not** arranged in a **rotationally symmetrical positioning** with respect to magnetoresistive elements 108-1, 130-4, 112-3 or 128-2. Thus, it is readily apparent that Wan does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features in claim 8. Furthermore, it is not readily apparent from Figure 2D or the associated text that the magnetoresistive elements illustrated in Figure 2D are connected to each other to form **two Wheatstone full bridges**. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Wan does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 8 for this additional reason. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Wan does not anticipate claim 8.

Since claim 10 depends from claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that Wan does not anticipate claim 10 for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. **Rejection of Claims 8 to 12 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 8 to 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,686 ("Van Delden et al.") and Wan. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Van Delden et al. and Wan does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

As set forth above, Wan does not disclose, or even suggest, eight GMR resistor elements arranged in a **rotationally symmetrical positioning** and does not disclose, or even suggest, eight GMR resistor elements connected to each other to form **two Wheatstone full bridges**. Van Delden et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, these features included in claims 8 and 14. The Office Action does not even allege that Van Delden et al. disclose such features. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Van Delden et al. and Wan does not render unpatentable either claim 8 or claim 14.

Since claims 9 to 12 depend from claim 8, it is respectfully that the combination of Van Delden et al. and Wan does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

Regarding the allegation of well known fact, Applicants respectfully **traverse** the unsupported contention that "[i]t is well known in the art that angle sensors such as that of Van Delden et al [sic] in view of Wan have been used for detecting an absolute position of a camshaft, or in a steering angle sensor system in a motor vehicle for sensing the speed of the motor vehicle." It is entirely unclear as to exactly what is considered to be well known. Thus, clarification is respectfully requested. Moreover, published information and/or an affidavit under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) is respectfully requested to support these otherwise unsupported contentions of well known fact.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. **Rejection of Claims 8 to 10 and 12 to 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 8 to 10 and 12 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0006017 ("Adelerhof") and Wan. It is respectfully submitted that the

combination of Adelerhof and Wan does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

As set forth above, Wan does not disclose, or even suggest, eight GMR resistor elements arranged in a **rotationally symmetrical positioning** and does not disclose, or even suggest, eight GMR resistor elements connected to each other to form **two Wheatstone full bridges**. Adelerhof does not disclose, or even suggest, these features included in claims 8 and 14. The Office Action does not even allege that Adelerhof discloses such features. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Adelerhof and Wan does not render unpatentable either claim 8 or claim 14.

Since claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Adelerhof and Wan does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

Regarding the allegation of well known fact, Applicants respectfully **traverse** the unsupported contention that “[i]t is well known in the art that angle sensors such as that of Adelerhof have been used for detecting an absolute position of a camshaft, or in a steering angle sensor system in a motor vehicle for sensing the speed of the motor vehicle.” It is entirely unclear as to exactly what is considered to be well known. Thus, clarification is respectfully requested. Moreover, published information and/or an affidavit under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) is respectfully requested to support these otherwise unsupported contentions of well known fact.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## **V. New Claims 15 to 18**

New claims 15 to 18 have been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that claims 15 to 18 add no new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the Specification.

Since claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the references relied upon for at least the reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 8.

Since claim 17 and 18 depend from claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17 and 18 are patentable over the references relied upon for at least the reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 14.

VI. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 21, 2007 By: Gerard A. Messina  
Reg. No. 35,952 *Mr. 42,144*

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**